

The John Birch Society -- Exposed!

By John "Birdman" Bryant

"The Rockefellers were also active on the 'right wing' front through their sponsorship of the John Birch Society. To enable Robert Welch, a 32nd degree Mason, to devote all of his time to the Society, Nelson Rockefeller purchased his family firm, the Welch Candy Company, from him at a handsome price. Welch chose the principal officers of the Society from his acquaintances at the Council on Foreign Relations. For years afterwards, American patriots were puzzled by the consistent inability of the John Birch Society to move forward on any of its well-advertised 'anti-Communist' goals. The fact that the Society had been set up at the behest of the backers of the world Communist revolution may have played some role in this development. Other patriots wondered why most American conservative writers, including the present writer, were steadily blacklisted by the Society for some thirty years. Despite thousands of requests from would-be book buyers, the Society refused to review or list any of my books. After several decades of futility, the Society was totally discredited by its own record." --Eustace Mullins, *Murder By Injection*, Staunton VA: National Council for Medical Research, 1988: 340-1

[Birdman note: The Rockefeller family is genetically Jewish, tho their religious affiliation is Baptist, and has had an intimate financial relationship with the world's most powerful Jewish family -- the Rothschilds -- since the 19th century. While Mullins' complaint against the JBS was that it ignored his books, a somewhat more revealing complaint was made by National Alliance founder Dr William Pierce, who in his early years was a member of the JBS, but left because of its effective prohibition on discussing the role of Jews in the communist conspiracy.]

Introductory note: In 1966, Prof Revilo Oliver (now deceased), who was co-founder (with eleven others) of the Birch Society and Associate Editor of its major organ, *American Opinion*, discovered that Robert Welch, the JBS's principal founder, was controlled by Jews, the purpose of said control being to harmlessly absorb and deflect the energy and money of patriotic Americans who wished to fight the 'international communist conspiracy', while leaving unmolested the Jewish-led conspiracy against America and Western civilization. In 1981 Oliver published *America's Decline: The Education of a Conservative*, in which he told the story of his discovery. Oliver's writings about this matter are lengthy, sometimes tedious, and, in a few parts, obscure; but I have taken the trouble to extract what I consider to be the most relevant parts of his two essays touching on this subject, and have reproduced these extracts below (the page numbers where the extracts appear are noted). I follow this with an essay of my own, whose purpose is to demonstrate that the Jewish subversion of the JBS is by no means an isolated phenomenon; and following this I reproduce a letter concerning these matters to John F Mcmanus, publisher of *The New American*, the JBS's principal organ and successor to *American Opinion* -- a letter which Mcmanus has so far not seen fit to answer.

While the reader will undoubtedly note Oliver's pessimism over the meaning of his discovery for the future of America and Western civilization, it is well to observe that the greatest hope for our struggle did not exist in 1981 -- the Internet.

America's Decline: Chapter V. The Great Deceit (excerpted)

p. 306

During his years as a master salesman, Welch had made many sales to confectioners and candy-manufacturers who were Jews residing in this country, and who, he said, complained to him openly and bitterly of the arrogance and financial exactions of the Jewish organizations to which they were almost enslaved. On that basis, he was, he said, convinced that it would be possible to induce a violent schism among the Jews in this country, many of whom, as the proprietors of very profitable businesses, would not only wish to escape the oppressive taxes constantly levied upon them by the B'nai B'rith and similar organizations, but would see, even more quickly than intelligent Americans, that the "International Communist Conspiracy" was preparing, by racial association, a hazardous future for them in this country ...

p. 308

The chances of inducing a schism among the Jews sufficient to impair their power over the United States seem to be minimal.

If -- as seems quite improbable -- Welch ever attempted such an operation, he walked into a trap. That became apparent when there appeared a strange pamphlet that bore the title, "The Neutralizers, by Robert Welch."

p. 309

.... the obvious purpose [of the pamphlet] was to suggest that adverse criticism of the Jews must be inspired by the Communists and that there must be no discrimination among races: hate the wicked Communists, but love everybody else -- a proposition that has an oddly theological ring!

The pamphlet was not implausible in some other respects, and, especially if withdrawn inconspicuously, as Welch once said he intended, would have done no great harm -- and it is given to few, if any, commanders never to make minor mistakes. But one soon began to hear reports of chapters and the contributors of generous subventions, who were being thrown out of the Society because they were known to have forbidden books, often without knowing they were sinning, since the Patriotic Pope in Belmont [ie, Welch: Oliver is unstinting in his sarcasm of Welch thruout the essay] had not published an *Index librorum prohibitorum*. To be sure, other motives were alleged for each expulsion, but after a large number of cases had accumulated, one could not miss the statistical significance of the one element that virtually all of them had in common.

pp. 310-311

Entirely apart from the Jewish problem, [It is unclear exactly what is meant here - the context does not provide an obvious answer] which was echinate and hard to handle, there was increasing evidence that what had been founded as a movement to recapture our country [ie, the Birch Society] was developing into a means of ineffectually squandering the money and the energies of Americans until they gave up in disgust or despair. And after a time, it became no longer possible to cherish the comforting notion that stupid, intriguing, or malevolent employees were uniquely responsible. The Society officially embarks on a clangorous programme to "Impeach Earl Warren", and several "coordinators", who take their jobs seriously, enlist the services of hundreds of members, organize caravans of automobiles to converge on Washington, and suitable banners and signs are prepared for each automobile, obviously through the work of many men and women -- and then, a few hours before the caravans are due to start, peremptory orders from Belmont cancel the entire operation! The Society officially proclaims in its loudest voice a national revival to "Support Your Local Police," and a considerable number of chapters in one region pool their resources to reprint in pamphlet form the Society's official pronouncements and to produce other material to command public attention, including thousands of matchbooks that are usually given with the purchase of cigarettes and which friendly storekeepers will distribute to their customers -- and after all that expense and hard work they receive a frenetic and paranoid letter from the Founder

threatening them with legal prosecution for using the Birch Society's slogan and copyrighted material! These examples make it unnecessary to cite less flagrant ones. And, since I had spoken extensively and some persons seemed inclined to trust me, I began to receive complaints not only from aggrieved or embittered former members, but from former "coordinators", who averred that they had been unable to carry out conscientiously orders from Belmont, had resigned, and had been forced, by threats of a blacklisting to prevent them from obtaining other employment, to sign "puppy-dog" letters of resignation, in which they professed to be heart-broken because family obligations or economic pressures had forced them to leave the service of the Grand Cham.

Complaints reached other members of the National Council who became perturbed. The Council continued to meet each quarter, but Welch effectively prevented discussion by always inviting a "guest," ostensibly a potential source of financial support, so that from 9 a.m. until about 4.30 p.m. the members of the Council [Author's note: Except those who had hearing aids and turned them off.] had to listen to glowing reports of Welch and from employees who were heads of sections in Belmont, and when the Council finally went into "executive session" late in the afternoon, there was time for only a question or two and interminably verbose answers by Welch before the clock struck five and there was a general rush for the bar.

Although the members of the Council who may be regarded as representing the Federal Reserve seemed content [this is apparently a reference to the Jewish members, as the legislation establishing the Fed was written by Rothschild agent Paul Warburg], quite a few others were seriously concerned and formed a committee to consider the plight of the Society, which they were inclined to attribute to the effects of a mild stroke that Welch had suffered in St. Louis and the influence of an employee in Belmont who was known to other members of the staff as "Snake Eyes." The committee, I need not say, included one "dissident" who regularly reported to Welch what was said by the "disloyal" individuals who questioned the infallibility of the Pontifex Maximus. Much time and effort was expended, but in the end it was found that a monolithic society is really monolithic: the Council could not even vote on a crucial question, since Welch would cancel the membership of any member suspected of "disloyalty" before he could cast his vote.

If it seems strange or even inexplicable that men did not resign in such circumstances, I can only say that some felt, as I did, that the Birch Society was a last effort that could not be repeated or duplicated. Its failure meant the defeat of all the purposes for which it had (presumably) been founded, and there could be no second chance.

To state the problem in the bluntest and crudest terms, such a movement [as the Birch Society sought to foment] requires money -- lots of money.

p. 312

Men who are in a position to make investments, even fairly modest ones, necessarily consider the record. It is relatively easy for a promoter (whether or not he is honest and veracious) to raise capital for a novel project -- a newly discovered gold field in the Aleutians, for example -- but when the first corporation has gone bankrupt, whatever the explanation, it becomes much more difficult and usually impossible to raise capital for a second attempt. Likewise, if the Birch Society failed, even though it could be plausibly argued that the failure was caused by the ineptitude or dishonesty of the promoter, there would be no chance of obtaining comparable subventions, and if the amount originally contributed had been inadequate, an attempt to form a new organization to replace it would certainly fail.

pp. 313-316

It was most unlikely that a would-be Savior of His Country would voluntarily sabotage his own effort, and I had eventually to ask myself whether he [Welch] was in fact a free agent and the author of the decisions be made. The question was startling, and each of the many incidents that depended on conflicting testimony was difficult to investigate, but I had one means of investigation that was under my own

control. It soon became evident that the intelligent young man who was editing *American Opinion* in Belmont was subject to pressures that he could not avow. It is true that even the best printers can be careless at times, and they can lose a paragraph or half a galley of type, but their negligence seems methodical when they lose precisely a paragraph that made passing mention of D'Israeli's published works and precisely the part of a review in which I referred to the infamous "Sedition Trial" of 1942-1944, which, although I had refrained from saying so, had been a premature attempt to impose the Jewish Terror on the American people. At my insistence, the review the printers had truncated was printed in full in a later issue, but there were other disquieting indications of a surreptitious influence.

I had to stipulate that nothing of mine was to be printed except, *ne varietur*, from final proof that I had approved; and I eventually decided to write a factual but cautiously expressed article that would clarify the mystery. It is printed for the first time below [excerpted].

That was in November 1965, and Welch -- having reportedly assured a member of his staff that he could lead the docile professor [ie, Oliver] whithersoever he wished -- flew to Urbana to persuade me to rewrite the review to endorse what he and I knew to be false: although the facts were beyond question and I had stated them modestly and circumspectly, they had to be concealed and denied, because, if published, they would "destroy" the John Birch Society -- for no intelligibly stated reason other than the ignorance and irrationality of the members whom the Society had supposedly been educating for seven years. His verbosity and exhortations to "keep my eye on the ball" while he, the master croupier, spun the wheel made it only more painfully evident there was just *one* subject about which the muddled members *had* to be deceived. I drew my own conclusions, but I was dismayed as I tried to discern in the equivocating and *frightened* little man the resolute and sagacious leader I thought I saw in 1958.

I refused to make the review mendacious, but I did agree to withdraw it, since I had editorial responsibilities for *American Opinion* that I could not honorably terminate until the July-August issue in 1966 had been sent to press. During that interview and later, however, I took care to make no commitments beyond that date.

[Editor's note: Oliver's review is too long to reproduce, and it is not entirely obvious what Welch wanted to suppress; however, we have quoted excerpts which are at least interesting, and most probably include the passages disliked by Welch.]

The Great Deceit: Social PseudoSciences by the Staff of Veritas Foundation; Zygmund Dobbs, Research Director. Introduction and epilogue by Archibald B. Roosevelt. Veritas Foundation, West Sayville, New York, [1964], 355 pages.

This is one of the most important books of our time.

The Veritas Foundation was established by alumni of Harvard who were dismayed by the realization that their alma mater, once the most highly reputed university in the Western Hemisphere, was being converted into an instrument of subversion and an incubator of traitors. The Foundation enlisted a research staff to ascertain how Harvard been transformed, and to fix, if possible, the responsibility. It soon became apparent that what had happened to Harvard did not differ significantly from what had happened, or was happening, to colleges and universities throughout the nation, and the scope of the Foundation's inquiries was accordingly enlarged.

In 1960, Veritas published its first report, *Keynes at Harvard*, of which a second edition appeared in 1962 (114 pages). This is a carefully documented disclosure of the means whereby a well-organized gang of Fabian Socialists was able to plant one of its members in the Department of Economics at Harvard under cover of a hypocritical plea that "all points of view" should be represented; to extend itself by patient, devious, and covert intrigues until it acquired control of the entire department; and finally to drive from the university all economists who refused to preach the gospel of Messiah Keynes and otherwise cooperate with the conspirators. In short, what happened to the honest economists at Harvard was what happened to the kind man in the old fable, who permitted the camel to introduce its nose into his tent.

Keynes at Harvard is fundamental reading for anyone who would understand the academic world today. It also teaches, through a specific example studied in detail, a cardinal fact about the organisation of the International Conspiracy. It demonstrated conclusively that the Fabian Socialists are a conspiratorial organization that uses systematically the standard Communist techniques of infiltration and deception to undermine and eventually destroy the United States and to enslave the American people. Although the Fabian Socialists usually proselytize in social circles in which avowed Bolsheviks would be at some disadvantage, and although they occasionally give voice to some mild disapproval or ineffectual criticism of the Soviet, they cooperate with the Communists in every major attack on our nation. This almost perfect coordination of effort over a period of many years cannot fail to suggest to every unbiased observer that, in all probability, the Fabian Socialists and the Communist Party are merely two tentacles of a single octopus.

Although the "liberal" press tried to blanket the book with silence, more than 130,000 copies of *Keynes at Harvard* have been sold, and the publication of the present volume [*The Great Deceit*], which covers the whole field of the so-called "social sciences" in American universities and colleges, evidently led to a change of policy. The work of the Veritas Foundation is now being attacked and decried -- notably in the pages of the *New York Times*, as was to be expected, and of *National Review*, to the astonishment of many readers of that publication. Since neither periodical would permit a reply to the allegations made in its pages, Mr. [Archibald] Roosevelt, who is one of the Trustees of the Foundation, has published, under the title *Strange Bedfellows*, a concise review of the reviews that appeared in the *Times* and in Mr. William F. Buckley, Jr.'s magazine.

In the *Times*, the notorious John Kenneth Galbraith either inadvertently or brazenly gave away the secret of the show in which he has long been a featured performer. As Mr. Roosevelt points out, Galbraith "denies that there is any conspiracy and then boasts about the manner in which the conspiracy was carried out," exulting that he and his accomplices carried out what he frankly calls "a revolution," and bragging about their cleverness in hoodwinking the stupid Americans. What is even more astonishing, Galbraith discards the old pretence that the Fabians and the Communists represent different purposes: he identifies as a great Fabian who played a "key role" in the "revolution" none other than that infamous alien subversive, Lauchlin Currie, who was identified under oath as an agent of Soviet Military Intelligence and fled from the United States to avoid interrogation.

National Review entrusted its job to the aging Henry Hazlitt, who enjoyed a high reputation as a defector from Socialism, but now repeats the old line about "guilt by association" and claims that it is very wicked to believe that there can be such a thing as a conspiracy. When a large number of persons act in concert with Machiavellian duplicity and subtlety, the only possible explanation, according to Mr. Hazlitt, is that they are sweet innocents, all of whom just happen to be "confused" in the same way. ...

[On the negative side] We must regretfully begin by remarking that a book which we heartily recommend does contain some *obiter dicta* that are historically false or misleading.

pp. 319-321

(3) The authors are certainly correct in pointing out that antipathies between Gentiles and Jews are systematically and cynically exploited by socialist conspirators, but they approach absurdity when they seem to suggest that anti-Jewish sentiments were invented by the socialists or else in the Middle Ages. It is simply an [sic, sic, sic!] historical fact -- deplorable, to be sure -- that the Jews have aroused antipathies wherever they have planted their colonies. Although the phenomenon is doubtless much older, the first clear and indisputable example comes from the Fifth Century B.C. The extant correspondence of that date between a wealthy Jewish colony on the island of Elephantine in the upper Nile and the directorate in the Temple in Jerusalem shows that the colony, although under the armed protection of the Persian Empire after the latter invaded and conquered Egypt, was so disliked by the native Egyptians that violence repeatedly occurred. Examples of similar tensions in many lands and among many races are innumerable in the course of subsequent history. The phenomenon not only appears long before Christianity, but it antedates the general adoption by the Jews of henotheism [the belief in a special

supreme god for each region, race, or nation] -- to say nothing of monotheism. A principal grievance of the Egyptians around Elephantine was that the Jews (although regarded as perfectly orthodox by their headquarters in Jerusalem) insisted on sacrificing to their five gods animals which the Egyptians regarded as sacred.

This phenomenon is, no doubt, painful to contemplate and difficult to explain, but rational men must try to understand the historical record, not ignore it.

(4) When the authors speak of "the infamous Dreyfus frame-up by French anti-Semites in 1894," they ignorantly repeat one of the big lies of modern times. This is so typical an example of mass-deception by "liberals" that it may be worth while to state here the simple facts that have been all but buried by tons of frenzied and strident journalism.

In 1894, it was discovered that French military secrets were being sold to Germany. An unsigned memorandum which accompanied one set of documents thus sold was stolen from the German Embassy in Paris by a French counter-espionage agent.

Captain Alfred Dreyfus was arrested. Although he may have been innocent, the court martial that convicted him of treason acted quite properly in doing so. They convicted him, not because he was a very wealthy Jew, but because (a) he was one of the twenty-three or thirty officers known to have had access to all of the documents listed in the memorandum: (b) the world's most famous criminologist, Alphonse Bertillon, swore positively that scientific tests proved that the memorandum was in Dreyfus's handwriting; and (c) Dreyfus *looked* guilty. Even Maurice Paleologue, who was firmly convinced that Dreyfus was innocent, confesses in his *Intimate Journal* that he found it extremely difficult to cling to that conviction when he was actually in the presence of Dreyfus and observed his behavior while on the witness stand in the subsequent trials: the man's voice and manner seemed to proclaim guilt. That was probably an unfortunate mannerism or defect of character, but so long as we have courts of justice, judges and juries will be influenced by the behavior of the accused, and their right to take that into consideration is recognized by law. ...

It is probable that Dreyfus was innocent, because (a) the German Ambassador in Paris, who was presumably a man of honor, categorically denied that any member of his staff had had dealings with Dreyfus, although he did not deny that secret documents had been purchased from some traitor; (b) it appears that the famous memorandum was in the handwriting of a Major Esterhazy, which, by one of those fantastic coincidences that do sometimes happen, was virtually identical to Dreyfus's; and (c) Esterhazy was one of two traitors who were eventually exposed.

If Dreyfus was "framed," the framing was done, not by "anti-Semites," but to protect the guilty. One of the latter was Major Esterhazy, an adventurer of uncertain antecedents who claimed to be an illegitimate descendant of the noble Hungarian family whose name he bore. On investigation into his private life, Esterhazy was found to be, in the words of Superintendent Cavard of the Surete Generale, "an adventurer, a blackguard, a cheat, a swindler, a pimp, a pillar [i.e., procurer] of the brothel," and there can be no doubt of his guilt, although he was permitted to escape from France, probably through the influence of his accomplice and probable superior, Maurice Weil. That unsavory creature, who was a close associate of Major Henry in Military Intelligence, had had to leave the Army and flee to Spain when exposed as a swindler and a cheat at horse-racing, but he soon crept back, partly through the expedient of prostituting his beautiful wife, imported from Vienna, to aged French generals with sensual appetites, including General Saussier, who was Commander-in-Chief. Major Weil, whose reinstatement may also have been facilitated by his intimacy with the Rothschilds, undoubtedly served as a German spy in the French Army, although he was never brought to trial, partly because the Army, after the Dreyfus affair, did not dare to accuse another Jew.

Dreyfus was eventually exonerated and reinstated. He had served as a pretext for violent agitation and controversy that convulsed France for twelve years. With few exceptions, his vociferous champions were not in the least interested in his innocence. They were socialist revolutionaries engaged in a frontal attack

on French conservatives, the French Army, and Christianity - especially the Catholic Church. They attained, as the direct result of their agitation, the drastic anti-clerical legislation which virtually ruined the French Church. And they obtained, by the same means, a political ascendancy in France that they have retained ever since.

p.322

The Great Deceit demonstrates simultaneously three truths that must be grasped and understood by Americans who hope that by intelligent effort they may yet save themselves and their children from massacre and slavery.

The first is that the Fabians represent an organized conspiracy to destroy by deceit. This fact they have themselves admitted ...

p. 323

Incidentally, nothing more clearly shows the Conspiracy's power and success - or more clearly proves the thesis of the present book - than the amazing fact that *Das Kapital*, described by its own author as excrement, is now inflicted on the hapless students in our colleges and universities as a "philosophy" to be studied seriously; is propagated as one of the "Great Books" by a wealthy Foundation that pretends to be engaged in "adult education"; and is cited as gospel by the many professors who are at last emerging from the woodwork and openly admitting that they are "Marxists".

The basic principle that all Americans must learn and apply every waking hour of the day is that public pronouncements made or instigated by members of the Conspiracy *never* mean precisely what the words seem to say. To grasp their real meaning, you must first correct them by making the conversions indicated for (a) the particular audience that the writer or speaker is trying to bamboozle, and (b) the specific objective that the Conspiracy is trying to attain.

p. 324

To appreciate socialist writing, you must note the specific situation in which it was produced. Here is one example. When we find John Maynard Keynes in 1925 expressing regret at the butchery in Russia and suggesting that it was "the fruit of some beastliness . . . in the Russian and Jewish natures when . . . they are allied", that does not in the least mean that Keynes disapproved of mass-murder or disliked either Russians or Jews. What it does prove is that Keynes in 1925 knew that the British public (a) was appalled by the ghastly savagery of the Bolsheviks, (b) had acquired specific information about it, such as the statistics first published in *The Scotsman* in November, 1923, showing the systematic extermination of priests, physicians, university professors, lawyers, and other members of the educated classes, and (c) could no longer be deceived by the pretense of a natural reaction against the tyranny of the Czars - a fiction that had become worn-out and unbelievable. He further knew that the British public knew that a very high percentage of the Bolsheviks who captured Russia were Jews. What the statement really means, therefore, is that Keynes, who had proclaimed himself a Bolshevik, realized in 1925 that he would have to find some way of apparently dissociating himself from what happened in Russia, if he was to continue effectively his work of subversion among the upper and educated classes of England; and he did so by attributing the events in Russia to a cause (an alliance of Russians and Jews) that could not conceivably operate in Great Britain.

p. 326

Finally the Veritas Foundation has studied the conspiratorial penetration and capture of the American academic system. The significant thing is the spread of corruption from out-and-out frauds, such as the phoney "science of education," to legitimate fields of study. Thus anthropology, which is conveniently limited to systematic observation and study of the lower forms of human life, was invaded by subversives

charged with the task of fabricating and distorting data to provide a basis for the absurd notion that all races are alike and equal.

p. 328

Whether the responsible and influential segment of the American public will study and heed *The Great Deceit*, I shall not predict. One thing is certain: if they do not, they are lost.

[end of review]

America's Decline: Chapter VI. Aftermath

[This chapter is included in its entirety except for footnotes]

I.

With the July-August issue of 1966, my connection with *American Opinion* came to an end. I think that is the point at which to conclude this series of selections. The cycle begun in 1954 was completed in 1966, and I had leisure to look back on twelve years of wasted effort and of exertion for which I would never again have either the stamina or the will.

After the conference between Welch and myself in November 1965, I determined to verify conclusively the inferences that his conduct had so clearly suggested, and, with the assistance of certain friends of long standing who had facilities that I lacked, I embarked on a difficult, delicate, and prolonged investigation. I was not astonished, although I was pained, by the discovery that Welch was merely the nominal head of the Birch business, which he operated under the supervision of a committee of Jews, while Jews also controlled the flow, through various bank accounts, of the funds that were needed to supplement the money that was extracted from the Society's members by artfully passionate exhortations to "fight the Communists." As soon as the investigation was complete, including the record of a secret meeting in a hotel at which Welch reported to his supervisors, I resigned from the Birch hoax on 30 July 1966 with a letter in which I let the little man know that his secret had been discovered.

On the second of that month I had kept an engagement to speak at the New England Rally in Boston, where I gave the address, "Conspiracy or Degeneracy?", which was later published with documentary and supplemental notes by Power Products, a short-lived publishing firm in Nedrow, New York. After the speech, I was warmly congratulated by Welch, who was delighted that it had been generously applauded by an audience of more than two thousand from whom he might recruit more members: he had not yet been informed by his supervisors that they disapproved. They did give him something of a dressingdown, and when I resigned, he had the idea of pretending that he had been horrified by a speech that contained racial overtones, such as well-trained Aryans must always eschew. And he had the effrontery -- which he later mitigated by claiming he had not received my letter -- he had the effrontery, I say, to fly to Urbana, accompanied by his lawyer and a former Director of the Federal Reserve, on the assumption that a poor professor could easily be bribed to sign a substitute letter of resignation, which he had thoughtfully written out for me, together with the article in the Birch *Bulletin* in which he was going to announce his surprise at receiving the letter he had written for me.

Welch's salestalk was perhaps a little constricted because he had always to speak with my tape recorder operating on the table between us, and since I wished to say nothing that he could later misinterpret, I resisted the temptation to feign negotiations and thus ascertain what was the very highest price he was prepared to pay for my honor and self-respect.

Since that sickening afternoon, I have been unable to think of the little shyster without revulsion and a feeling that I have been contaminated by association with him. I have tried to be not only scrupulously fair to him in the foregoing pages, but to give him the benefit of every possible doubt, and I believe I have succeeded, but it has cost me some effort.

There were other resignations at approximately the same time. Dr. Draskovich, whose personal observation of the preliminaries of a Bolshevik take-over gave him expert knowledge, had investigated the Birch Society's field operations and come to the conclusion that the Society served only to waste in futile and nugatory activities the money, time, and energy of its patriotic members, so that it really served the purposes of the very forces that it professed to be fighting. He resigned with a public statement. The three Directors of Public Relations, the Society's most important officers after Welch himself, all resigned, although he was able to induce them in various ways not to make their departures quite simultaneous. Each of us acted independently of the others, and I had not tried to influence anyone, but Welch characteristically saw a chance to claim that I had tried to "undermine" him and replace him as the head of his racket, and he went slinking about the country with a fifty-seven-page denunciation of me, most of it so libellous that he had to show it only on an "eyes-only" basis to wealthy contributors whom he wanted to continue milking. By that time, he could have done nothing that would have augmented my contempt and loathing, and perhaps I should have felt flattered by the fifty-seven pages. A man who joined the Council long after I left and has recently resigned tells me that he was accorded only seventeen pages of paranoid denunciation.

After that last nauseating conference, I issued to the press an announcement that was widely reproduced:

Professor Revilo P. Oliver, one of the founding members of the John Birch Society, issues the following statement:

"I have resigned from the Council of the John Birch Society (and from the Society itself) because I can no longer in conscience remain a member. I have also resigned as Associate Editor of *American Opinion* and I will no longer contribute to that magazine.

"I was one of the eleven men who met with Mr. Robert Welch in Indianapolis on December 9, 1958, when the Society was formed. The Mr. Welch who founded the Society was a man in whom I had great confidence.

"Since then, however, changes which have taken place internally in the organization and in its policies leave me no alternative but to dissociate myself from it."

I felt a moral obligation to persons whom I might have influenced to join the Birch operation, and I thought that my statement and especially the phrase "*in conscience*" would suffice to warn them that something was putrescent in Belmont.

To the men who had been my associates on the Council I sent a letter of which the substance is the following:

The compelling reasons for my resignation were stated in my letter to Mr. Welch, . . . I enclose a copy of the statement which I am making to the press. You will note that it is couched in the mildest possible terms and eschews mention of the real issues. I am resolved not to elaborate on that statement or make public my letter of resignation to Mr. Welch, unless he forces me to do so by grossly misrepresenting its contents or publicly making defamatory charges against me.

I urge each of you personally to investigate very thoroughly the present situation of the Society and the extent to which its leader does, in fact, determine its policies. I hope that the Society can be salvaged, but that is your responsibility.

Two men telephoned me to say that they had already intended to fade out without publicity, thus avoiding the nastiness of an open break with the Welcher. How the others reacted then or at the following meeting of the Council, I do not know, nor was I interested in finding out. I felt that I had given them, too, sufficient warning while sparing them possible embarrassment.

II.

I have paid almost no attention to the Birch business since I resigned. I am somewhat astonished that Welch's superiors still think it worth the expense of supporting it, even though it does provide a playground on which innocent but perturbed Americans can run off their energies in harmless patriotic games. Friends still send me copies of some of the more remarkable verbiage that spurts from Belmont, and I note that Welch, perhaps on instructions, no longer has much to say about the "Communist Conspiracy," and, after flirting with the notion of reactivating Weishaupt's diabolic Illuminati, seems to have settled on the conveniently nameless and raceless "Insiders" as the architects of all evil, inspired by an unexplained malevolence. The principal purpose, aside from keeping the members in a revenue-producing excitement, is to make certain that their chaste minds are insulated against a wicked temptation not to love their enemies. The pronouncements from Belmont are of some slight interest, since one may be sure that the B'nai Birch are told only what has been approved by the B'nai B'rith. In addition to the *Bulletin*, often called the "Welch Belch" by bored members, the Society still publishes *American Opinion* and the *Review of the News*, for which very competent journalists are hired to write under Jewish supervision, and both periodicals contain some authentic information that is not found in the *New York Times*, since they are censored for distribution to a different audience. A considerable misdirection of the members' thinking is thus produced, but even as an impediment to the American cause, the Birch hoax is virtually negligible. As Mr. Thomas J. Davis, the former Director of Public Relations of the Birch Society, told the *Wall Street Journal* in 1967, "I do not know of anything that would make the John Birch Society rise to a position of importance."

It is true that today, fourteen years later, the salesmen, thanks to well-written house organs, can still sell memberships to earnest people who are worried and don't know do about it, but in practical terms the Birch Society has a political importance about equal to that of the Mennonite churches, which have a much larger membership of earnest and hard-working men and women in various communities, where they may be seen driving their covered buggies on the shoulders of highways while they resolutely hold to their faith and avert their eyes from all the works of the Devil. I have discussed Welch's promotion in these pages only because the record requires some explanation of my mistaken association with it, and the Society that was founded in 1958 has some historical significance as comparable to Colonel Hadley's Paul Revere and Major Pease's International Legion Against Communism, which also had a quite considerable potential at one time, although they failed for different reasons.

After my resignation, many individuals urged me to "expose" the Welcher, but almost all of them had already perceived that the Society had become a Jewish auxiliary, primarily used to keep the *goyim* confused and docile and to frustrate patriotic movements that had any potentiality of effectiveness. A retired justice somewhat whimsically suggested the formation of a John Birch Alumni Association, which could have a membership much more numerous than the "undergrads" who were still paying dues to Belmont. A number of men and women urged me to take the lead in establishing an organization that would really have the purposes that Welch professed. I refused to attempt what I was certain was impossible, because, as I have explained earlier, there could be no second chance.

The Birch Society was essentially an effort *by the Aryans* of the middle class. My pleasantest memories connected with it are of my gracious hosts, the members of local chapters in various cities throughout the nation who sponsored my lectures on its behalf. The men and women whom I thus met were the finest type of Americans, and I enjoyed the afternoons and evenings I spent in their company, but they were *all* (so far as I could tell) members of our race [i.e., white gentiles]. But almost without exception, those intelligent and amiable men and women had failed to draw the obvious deduction from that fact -- failed to regard the racial bond that was the one thing they all had in common, for the managers of the Birch business had actually endorsed the poisonous propaganda that teaches Aryans that they are the one race that has no right to respect itself or even be conscious of its identity, and that they must forever cringe before their unappeasable enemies, both sophisticated and savage, while toiling to subsidize them. Many of those estimable persons would have been shocked by a suggestion that they had a right to consider first their own welfare and that of their children, for that would have been "selfish" and even sceptics have been imbued with the hoary Christian hokum that we must love those who hate us. There was, therefore, no feasible course of action in 1966, when I knew that those well-meaning Aryans had been betrayed and I

felt certain that their cause had been irretrievably lost -- although I tried to hope that my estimate was somehow wrong.

III.

The American middle class has now been liquidated, except for a few remnants that are found here and there and are tolerated because they have no vestige of political power and will soon disappear anyway. A middle class can be based only on property -- on the *secure* possession of *real* property of which a man can be divested only by his own folly. A middle class cannot be formed of comparatively well-paid proletarians who may have a theoretical equity in a hundred-and-fifty-thousand-dollar house they are "buying" on a thirty-five year mortgage, and in a fifteen-thousand-dollar automobile for which they will not have paid before they "trade it in" on a more expensive and defective vehicle. Nor can it be formed of proletarians whose wives have to work -- whether as "executives" or as charwomen -- to "make ends meet." With the exception of relicts who live on investments that have not yet been entirely confiscated by taxation, the economic revolution is as complete in the United States as in Soviet Russia: there are only proletarians, some of whom are hired to manage the rest. Managerial employees get more pay and ulcers than janitors and coal miners, but they are equally dependent on their wages and even more dependent on the favor of the employee above them. The nearest approximation to a middle class, both here and in Russia, is the bureaucracy, and it is their vested interest that the Birchers imagine they can destroy.

The poor Birchers go on playing patriotic games on their well-fenced playground. They pay their dues and buy books and pamphlets from Belmont to distribute to persons who may read the printed paper before discarding it. They continue, now and then, to coax a few friends to hear an approved speaker, who, if not a Jew himself, at least knows who his bosses are, and they all listen excitedly as he tells them how very bad everything is, from Washington to Timbuctoo, without ever mentioning any of the nasty facts of race and genetics, about which nice boys and girls should never think. Their little band is going to save the world politely and decorously by buying more books and pamphlets from Belmont and by practicing what Welch calls morality, an idle sentimentality compounded from the old hokum about "all mankind" and the inflated fustian of Emerson's Transcendental rhetoric, seasoned, of course, with the famous "upward reach," which employees in Belmont, who know what the business is about, privately call "the upward retch."

So far as one can understand the mystique of the Birch boys, they imagine they are going to save the world by talking about what they are sold as neat packages of "truth," and since they could never think of being unkind to anyone and would certainly swoon at the mere mention of violence, they must suppose that the wonder will be wrought by votes at some election. It appears, therefore, that they never take pencil and paper and compute the number of persons who are eligible to vote, noting how many are their hereditary enemies, how many are in one way or another directly on the Federal payroll, how many more are employed by local governments (all of which are now subsidiaries supported by "revenue-sharing"), and how many more depend on employers who depend on the favor or at least toleration of the great engine of corruption in Washington. Then they can compute the pitiable number of persons who would or *could* vote for "less government" etc., even *if*, by some miracle, they had a chance to do so.

Even more remarkable is the odd fact that Welch's congregation seems never to reflect that the Birch business has been running for twenty years, has accomplished nothing whatsoever except sop up the money and energy of well-meaning American Aryans, and now, after twenty years, has a membership that, on the most optimistic estimate, is but half of what it had at its peak, sixteen years ago. Does no member reflect that even if the Birch line is the "truth," it is obviously ineffectual -- that it never did, and never will, attract even a modicum of politically significant support, and that by its very nature it can never generate the kind of enthusiasm that is willing to *fight* rather than to talk?

The B'nai Birch, to be sure, may bask in the approval of their amused and contemptuous Jewish supervisors, and they may feel some satisfaction that they keep their minds so pure and moral that they hate the wicked "racists," who believe, rightly or wrongly, that our race is fit to live, and who have the *one* cause that might *conceivably* generate sufficient political power to preserve us from the ignominious

end of cowards fit only for slavery and a squalid death. But even in this respect the Birch hoax, now so insignificant that the prostitutes of the press forget to say unkind things now and then to make the members feel important, has become so impotent that it will not measurably affect our fate, whatever that is to be.

So long as it was honest (*if* it ever was), the Birch Society represented the last hope of American Conservatism, of the effort to restore the values and the freedom of the way of life of our Aryan forefathers on this continent -- to regain what they lost when they thoughtlessly permitted their country to be invaded, their government to be captured, and their society to be systematically debauched and polluted [by] whining aliens. The American tradition was a fair and indeed noble one, and it still has the power to awaken nostalgia for a world that no man living has himself experienced, but for practical purposes, it now has only a literary and historical significance. To be sure, there are, outside the inconsequential Birch playpens, earnest men and women who still hope to restore the decent society and strictly limited government of that tradition, and their loyalty to what has ineluctably passed away entitles them to respect, just as we respect the British Jacobites, who remained loyal to the Stuarts and nourished hopes for a century after Culloden, and as we respect the earnest men and women in France who, as late as 1940, remained loyal to the Bourbons and dreamed of restoring them to their throne. But such nostalgic aspirations for the past are mere romanticism. They are dangerously antiquarian illusions today, when the only really fundamental question is whether our race still has the will-to-live or is so biologically degenerate that it will choose extinction -- to be absorbed in a pullulant and pestilential mass of mongrels, while the triumphant Jews keep their holy race pure and predatory.

American Conservatism is finished, and its remaining adherents are, whether they know it or not, merely ghosts wandering, mazed, in the daylight. And it is at this point that the present volume of selections from what I wrote on behalf of a lost cause fittingly ends.

[End of Oliver excerpts]

The Larger Lesson of the Birch Subversion

The subversion of the John Birch Society by establishment Jewry is *not* an isolated incident. Exactly how much subversion there has been of organizations whose intended purpose is to represent the interests of white gentiles, the American nation and Western civilization I cannot say, but I direct the reader's attention to the following cases of which I have at least some knowledge:

The Institute for Historical Review: Willis Carto, the most prominent and most effective opponent of establishment Jewry, is the founder of Liberty Lobby, the *Spotlight* newspaper, the Populist Party, the Noontide Press, the *Barnes Review*, and the Institute for Historical Review (IHR), among other institutions and organizations. The IHR was founded to forward the cause of 20th century historical revisionism generally, and Holocaust revisionism in particular. A few years ago, several employees of the IHR staged what has been called a *coup d'etat*, in which they wrested control of the IHR from Carto and his allies -- a coup whose success was later confirmed in court actions.

Part of the motivation for the coup was that Carto wished to expand the scope of IHR activity, apparently on the theory that Holocaust revisionism had "gone about as far as it could go" and was becoming, in the words of revisionist historian David Irving, "boring, boring, boring". This frightened both the employees and revisionist scholars associated with the IHR, who saw their livelihood and celebrity status threatened

Another probable motive for the coup was the estate of an Edison fortune heir, which the IHR partisans maintained was left to the IHR, but which Carto claimed was left to him for the purpose of promoting revisionism.

But while the above motives were undoubtedly important, a third aspect of the coup was that it involved persons with links to Jewish organizations, thus suggesting that there was Jewish support or instigation of

the coup in hopes that the IHR might be neutralized in the same way that the JBS has been. A particularly curious aspect is the coup's link with Scientology:

- Two of the IHR employees who were involved in the plot were Scientologists.
- The coup occurred on the same day that Scientology was recognized as a church for tax purposes by a Jewish IRS director, thus saving it millions of dollars in tax obligations, this recognition coming after a long and bitter battle between Scientology and the IRS.
- There have been allegations that control of Scientology was wrested from founder L Ron Hubbard's widow, and is now under the control of Jews.

While I have only a very superficial knowledge of the IHR affair, my strong suspicion is that Carto is correct in seeing the hands of Jews in the coup, tho -- having seen a letter which he wrote to revisionist and former IHR editor Bradley Smith, and knowing that he has had bitter fights with several major figures on the Right who were once his close allies -- I am ready to believe that at least some of the blame for the coup must rest with Carto, whose report card keeps coming back stamped 'Does not get along well with others'. And while I think Carto was right from a business perspective in attempting to expand the scope of the IHR, I think he made a tactical mistake to suddenly pull the rug out from under the revisionist warrior-scholars who were the IHR backbone. My main reason for supporting Carto in this affair is that he has published detailed accusations against his IHR foes on numerous occasions in the *Spotlight*, but these accusations have basically been ignored by the IHR people in their *Journal*, thereby suggesting that there were no credible answers to the Carto charges.

American Renaissance: The magazine *American Renaissance* is the brainchild of Samuel Jared Taylor, whose book *Paved With Good Intentions*, like his magazine, does an excellent job of covering the ugly realities of race from the white perspective. There's only one small problem -- the Jewish dimension is never mentioned. And while Taylor has -- admirably -- sought alliance with prominent politically-incorrect Jews such as my friend Rabbi Mayer Schiller and my one-time friend Michael Levin, it seems to be much more than an act of good manners that Taylor does not allow the Jewish Question to be discussed in *AR*; for there is a peculiar and unexplained relationship between Taylor and the ADL which has been explored by Willis Carto in the pages of the *Spotlight*, but to which Taylor refuses to respond except with the most superficial of replies, at least to me. So we have to ask, is this JBS *deja vu* all over again?

The Populist Observer/Nationalist Times: For four years I wrote a monthly column for the *Nationalist Times*, whose original title was the *Populist Observer* when it was the official organ of the Populist Party. While the Party itself was founded by Willis Carto, the paper was founded by Don Wassall, who remains its editor. While I was writing my columns, I generally stuck to denouncing liberalism, and rarely wrote about Jews. But occasionally I would send in a column on this subject, and would invariably find it spiked. Finally, I asked Don why, and his response was that he was afraid of being labeled a 'neo-nazi'. In my response I pointed out to him that *TNT* (altho not Wassall personally) had *already* been so labeled (or at least dubbed a close equivalent) by an official publication of the ADL, the Jewish 'watchdog' agency and smearbund. I also decided that it was time to leave *TNT*. So again I ask, *Deja vu*?

Mark Lane: Willis Carto is a man whose actions -- if not always perfect -- have shown him to be unquestionably sincere in his fight for white gentile interests and against the hegemony of Judah. But there is one peculiarity about Carto which -- tho not putting his sincerity into question -- nonetheless raises the question of whether the Jewish establishment has a nigger in Carto's woodpile -- his brilliant lawyer, Mark Lane. I am not here implying that I have a problem with Lane's Jewishness *as such* (I don't); rather, the problem is with Lane's curious connections. Specifically, Lane was the lawyer for Jim Jones and the People's Temple (the folks who took the Kool Aid Prussic Acid Test in Guyana), and what is more, he has been in some way connected to Lee Harvey Oswald prior to the Kennedy assassination. (Lane is also -- according to a friend of mine who knows about such things, a leftist.) While there is nothing necessarily Jewish about these connections, it may be noted that Lane wrote a famous book on the Kennedy assassination, *Rush to Judgment*, and later saved Carto from ruin by winning a very difficult court case against E Howard Hunt by proving that Hunt was part of the Kennedy assassination team. Now here is the Jewish connection: In recent years, Carto has been promoting a book by Michael Collins

Piper on the assassination entitled *Final Judgment*, whose claim to fame is heavy-duty evidence that the prime mover of the dirty deed was *Israel* (because Kennedy was putting pressure on the Israelis to abandon their then-secret nuclear weapons cache). As I pointed out to Piper, Kennedy was wrong, since what he was trying to do in effect was to impose 'gun control' on Israel -- whom we may regard as a rogue state, but whose right of self defense we would not deny. (Note: Carto refused to publish my letter on this subject in the *Spotlight*, in spite of Piper's recommendation.) But my point about Lane -- however tenuous -- is the question: Could Lane's thesis have been intended as a distraction so the Israeli connection wouldn't be discovered by Carto & Company? Frankly, I have no idea -- I am simply asking.

In the present context it is worth mentioning that the secret takeover of organizations by Jews is by no means a new phenomenon, as detailed in an article on 'Trusts' published by Willis Carto's newspaper, *The Spotlight*, which we have reproduced at the end of this essay. It is also worth mentioning that, as noted by Laird Wilcox (*The Hoaxer Report* and other writings) that organized Jewry has been known on many occasions to fabricate antisemitism for the purpose of sympathy or political influence. (Our government seems to have been following this lead by its participation in the World Trade Center bombing (a government agent built the bomb) or the Oklahoma City bombing -- great excuses for shaving a few more points off the Bill of Rights.) So next time you see a white-rights organization, *cherchez la connection juive*.

In conclusion, we must ask, What attitude should we take to organizations which we suspect may be compromised by enemy infiltration? The only answer I can give is: *look at their behavior*. If it is worthwhile, even if not perfect, then it may be worthy of support. Imperfection is everywhere, whether from subversion or just stupidity, so we must learn to 'Take the good, and leave the bad, and gather grains of gold while letting blow the chaff' (Don't get out your Bartlett -- it's a quote from Yours Truly). The lesson here is perhaps that of Edward Sill's poem, "Opportunity":

This I beheld, or dreamed it in a dream:

There spread a cloud of dust along a plain,

And underneath the cloud, or in it, raged

A furious battle, and men yelled, and swords

Shocked upon swords and shields. A prince's banner

Wavered, then staggered backward, hemmed by foes.

A craven hung along the battle's edge

And thought, "Had I a sword of keener steel,

That blue blade that the King's son bears, but this

Blunt thing! -- he snapped and flung it from his hand

And lowering crept away and left the field.

Then came the King's son, wounded, sore bestead,

And weaponless, and saw the broken sword

Hilt-buried in the dry and trodden sand

And ran and snatched it, and with battle shout,

Lifted afresh, he hewed his enemy down,

And saved a great cause that heroic day.

And remember, it ain't over till it's over.

'New' IHR Operates as KGB-style 'Trust' for Mossad

(From *The Spotlight*, c 1999)

Many supporters of Liberty Lobby and the revisionist movement wonder why the "new" Institute for Historical Review (IHR) under the control of Mark Weber and the people behind him could actually be a front for Israel's Mossad since the IHR continues to publish what is otherwise valuable revisionist literature. The fact is that for the Mossad to be able to continue to wage its war of attrition against Liberty Lobby, using the pressure of the legal judgment obtained against Liberty Lobby by Weber's backers through the venue of the IHR, it is necessary for the IHR to continue operating as a corporate entity. If the IHR were to cease operating Liberty Lobby would not legally be obligated to continue paying the judgment. Therefore it is vital that the existence of the IHR be maintained. If Liberty Lobby itself should somehow be eviscerated in the meantime, it is certain that the Mossad controllers behind Weber and the IHR would immediately pull the plug on the IHR. The fact is that the "new" IHR functions as a classic "trust," which is defined in more standard terms as "controlled opposition." That is, the Mossad is using the IHR as a means to monitor the revisionist movement from within, collecting names of persons involved in revisionism and studying their activities.

IHR MOSSAD-CONTROLLED Although the IHR is a Mossad-controlled "trust," the term "trust" came into intelligence usage, stemming from a famous Soviet secret police counterintelligence operation established in the 1920s and known as 'The Trust.' According to Professor Roy Godson of Georgetown University (who is known for his ties to the Israeli lobby), the Soviets used the "trust" model to actually finance and control their own opposition and to feed disinformation to anti-communists in the West, who believed that they were receiving data from anti-Bolshevik elements from behind Soviet lines. The Soviets used the Trust to lure its critics out into the open so that they could be made targets of Soviet state security. That is precisely how the Mossad is now using the IHR in order to surveil the revisionist movement. In the same fashion, the Mossad-sponsored Anti-Defamation League (ADL), and the Southern Poverty Law Center of Morris Dees also create previously non-existent "hate" groups and finance their activities, or otherwise promote organizations that have been co-opted by the Mossad and/or by the CIA, the BATF, the FBI and other federal agencies which have an interest in controlling political dissent in America. Strong evidence indicates that two prominent "racists" operating in America today are actually "controlled opposition." It is very much a "wilderness of mirrors."

Letter to John McManus, publisher of JBS's *The New American*, June 25, 2000

Dear Mr McManus:

The following are three important facts concerning which I would like to ask a question:

(1) As publisher of *The New American*, the major organ of the John Birch Society and rival of *Time* and *Newsweek*, you are obviously an influential man in the JBS.

(2) The principal activity of the JBS since its founding has been to unmask and report on what it claims is a 'conspiracy' to take over the world.

(3) According to WorldNetDaily reporter/columnist JR Nyquist, you yourself believe in the validity of the *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, which describes a Jewish conspiracy to take over the world.

The question I would like to ask is, In view of the above facts, why is it that the Jewish element of the conspiracy which the JBS alleges to exist is never mentioned in the *New American* or any other JBS literature, except in the (unimportant) sense that Jews *as individuals* are sometimes mentioned as participants? Are you only a front man with no real influence?

The following are more facts about which I would like to ask some questions: About 35 years ago, the late Prof Revilo Oliver, one of the original founders of the JBS, resigned from the JBS and from his position as associate editor of *American Opinion*, the forerunner of *The New American*, because, according to his account, he discovered that the JBS, and the principal founder, Robert Welch, were controlled by Jews, this control being for the purpose of subverting the stated goals of JBS while giving the appearance of promoting them, thereby siphoning off the money and energy of those who sought to promote those goals thru the JBS (I have posted the relevant documents on my website, www.ematic.com/birdman/). (A number of major functionaries of the JBS resigned at approximately the same time as Oliver, and for approximately the same reasons.) While the evidence which Oliver put forward to substantiate his allegations was primarily inferential and circumstantial (the scuttling of important projects before they could have the intended effect, the behavior of Welch at quarterly Board meetings, the 'dropping' of important text in Oliver's articles, and of course the resignations of Oliver and other important functionaries), Oliver implied that he had much more evidence, but would not publish it unless Welch publicly attacked him. It should, of course, be pointed out that, while the JBS in its early years was supposedly opposing the 'international communist conspiracy' (it has now morphed to 'the Insiders'), there was never any recognition or acknowledgement by the JBS that communism was conceived, instituted and led by Jews, as have been all (or virtually all) subsequent 'liberal' movements -- socialism, feminism, labor unionism, gun control, Net censorship, immigration, miscegenation, etc; so the failure to mention and discuss this fact openly in JBS literature, along with the fact -- observed by many -- that the JBS forbids discussion of the Jewish connection to the 'conspiracy', is strong evidence, independent of Oliver's, to indicate Jewish control of the JBS. My question about the above facts is threefold:

(1) Does the JBS formally deny the Oliver charges?

(2) Has there been any attempt to prove them false, as by making an audit to demonstrate that JBS funds are not coming from (or controlled by) Jewish sources?

(3) Isn't the fact that JBS literature and policy still avoid the Jewish link a pretty good indication that the JBS is still controlled by Jews?

Another question: Is all the prating which the *New American* does about 'morality' a kind of self-destruct mechanism intended to make the JBS implode should the immorality and hypocrisy of its operations (as alleged by Oliver) be discovered by the membership?

And finally, would it be possible to make the JBS be honest about its Jewish connection and the Jewish nature of the 'conspiracy' by my sending a copy of this letter to the principal people who are being ripped off by the JBS, namely, its advertisers?

I plan to post this letter on my website, and I will be happy to post or link any relevant response which you or any other major figure of the JBS may see fit to send me.

[McManus replied to this letter with a letter dated 5 July. While I have not reproduced this letter here, my response to this letter given below gives the substance of his remarks.]

Reply to John Mcmanus, July 14, 2000

Re: Response to snailmail letter of 5 July

Dear Mr Mcmanus:

Let me begin by saying that my 25 June letter contained some hyperbole which I would have better made more litotical. But for all that, I think that unpleasant truths tend to be regarded as 'nasty', to use your word, and for this reason I can understand why you were upset.

But my writing style is in no way substantive. What is substantive is that you failed to answer an important question I asked you. In particular, do you deny that you personally believe in the validity of the *Protocols*, and do you deny that you told JR Nyquist that you did? These questions are important, because if you believe in the *Protocols*, then it remains to explain why the magazine of which you are publisher, and which specializes in advancing 'conspiracy theory' (your term), never mentions *Jewish* conspiracy, of which the *Protocols* is the best-known exposition. It will not do to say, as you did in your letter, that 'the Society' does not regard the *Protocols* as valid; the question is whether *you* do.

(For the record, I am well aware of the 'spuriousness' of the *Protocols*, inasmuch as I have personally verified that they were plagiarized from a mid-19th century French book; but I do not at all discount the intriguing possibility that the *Protocols* may have significantly influenced and directed the thinking of Jewish leaders in a sort of ironic self-fulfilling prophecy.)

As expected, you deny that the Oliver charges are true, and you attempt to justify your denial by saying that Oliver (1) 'was never able to back up any of his assertions' and (2) had made some 'indefensible claims' concerning the Kennedy assassination which were published in *American Opinion*, the forerunner of *TNA*, and which *AO* had to retract, and you seem to suggest -- but do not openly state -- that this was the cause of Oliver's resignation as *AO*'s Associate Editor.

As to point (1), it is probably mistaken to say that Oliver *couldn't* back up his charges, but rather only that he did not in fact publish the details. The most likely reason for his behavior, as I see it, is that he held out hope that the Society could be reformed from within once his charges -- backed up by his resignation and prestige -- had become known; whereas if he had published a detailed account, it would have destroyed the Society.

As to point (2), if this is true, I'd like to hear the details, but it sounds like something taken from the 57-page document which was mentioned by Oliver in his articles, which he said Welch showed to big contributors, and which he noted was so libelous that it was never published, but shown only to individuals on an 'eyes-only' basis.

But the important thing about the Oliver charges is not whether we can verify them (a very difficult undertaking), but rather that they act to explain an otherwise unexplainable fact about the JBS, namely, that the discussion of the 'conspiracy theory' which the JBS is so single-minded in pursuing is never allowed to so much as touch on *Jewish* conspiracy, and members who *do* pursue it are expelled. The fact is curious not merely because no proper investigation of a subject should automatically exclude any germane area, but also -- and primarily -- because it is usually obvious to anyone who bothers to study the subject that the effect of the coordinated actions of Jewish organizations and individuals (ie, 'Jewish conspiracy') is a major factor in a great many significant events impacting our nation and the world -- a fact to which I have devoted a number of essays posted on my website, www.ematic.com/birdman.

What I am trying to say is this: the JBS is lying by omission in making Jewish conspiracy off-limits. This is bad not merely because it violates a fundamental ethical principle (like, I mean, no lying, right, man?), but also because it misleads people and makes them look for the threats to Western civilization in all the

wrong places (or at least all the places except the *really important* one). This badness is of course compounded because the JBS promotes itself as a beacon of morality, which it constantly prates about in the pages of the *New American*. The significance of the Oliver charges, then, is that they help to make sense of what would otherwise be incomprehensible, ie, why an organization devoted to exposing conspiracy against Western civilization seems engaged in a conspiracy to suppress exposure of what it is supposedly exposing. And this fact -- combined with (1) Oliver's status as a star academic, *American Opinion* Associate Editor, and founding member of the JBS, (2) the fact that Oliver had no other good reason to resign from the JBS, (3) the fact that his JBS expose -- even if incomplete -- was very detailed, and (4) the fact that there have been other instances of Jewish takeover of supposedly-hostile organizations -- all of these taken together makes Oliver's charges *more than credible*.

And that, of course, brings us right back to the question you would not answer: Do you believe in the validity of the *Protocols*, as you told JR Nyquist, and if so, why does the magazine of which you are publisher fail to mention the Jewish role in 'conspiracy theory'? Here again we have a fact supporting Oliver's charges: It seems that you believe in Jewish conspiracy, but are constrained from saying so by some Higher Power whose name seems to be spelled in Hebrew letters, and it isn't the tetragrammaton.

In sum, Mr Mcmanus, your letter neither enhances your own credibility nor does anything significant to impeach Oliver. I am posting this letter on my website, and I will be happy upon request to link any relevant document which you believe will better make your case.

* * [Back to the Home Page of John "Birdman" Bryant, the World's Most Controversial Author](#) * *